G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references.

576 - 1 - 2

1914.

(Inam Esc)

Later references.

File No. 628-14

Serial Nos. 1–6

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1 – 6

Part B for Nov. 16

SUBJECT.

Proprietorship of the temple of Sri Ranganatha Devaru at Sorab to S. No. 11 of Hirekakkine village, Sorab Taluk.

To Dy. Comm. Shimoga & Comptr. & Govt.

No. 1223–4 Dt. 18–11–16.

Cancels the bill for Rs 161 on account of expenditure for the above & requests the Dy. Comm to examine the temple leases with a view to their revision & submit a report on action taken

W D 88—GPB—50,000—24-7-16

D-R Box. 11 5–12–16.

G. R. S. 11] 1914-15

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(Mug)

NOTES.

File No. 628-14

FILE HEADING.

Proprietorship of the temple of Sri Ranganatha Devaru at Sorab to S. no. 4 of Kiresakane village, Sorab Taluk.

From

The Dy: Comr, Shimoga Distt

No. 517/90 Dated 2-6-15 Received 4-6-15

Diary No. 1981	Enclos.-	Spare Copies.	Serial No. 1

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER.

States, with reference to G.O. G-no. 2662-3/Mug. 576 11-2 & 4-5-12, sanctioning a bill for Rs 15/- towards the cost of establishing the proprietorship of the temple to certain land, that as the temple is entitled to only the Kandaya of the land, the claim of the cultivators for the possession of the land was not contested by the Vakeel on behalf of the temple; that the suit ended in a compromise between the parties; that the Munsiff

~~NOTES AND ORDERS.~~

has passed a decree in favour of the plaintiff Nagappa Subba Rao; & that no expenditure was incurred in the case and forwards, therefore, the bill for cancellation.

Draft recording the letter and cancelling

NOTES—First Sheet.

GPB-20,000-8 8-14

Serial No.

the bill is subd for approval or orders.

SD 28/7 12/8/15

2. Request the Dy Comr to send up for reference the Ver. papers and also to indicate the evidence upon which the conclusion is based that Bullamma and her representatives are Kadim tenants entitled to pay only the assessment on the land to the temple.

3 Also call for an extract of Inam register

hs 12.8.15

4 subd with two drafts, one to the Dy: Comr and the other to the Inam Supdt, for approval.

SD 13/8 12/8/15 ALW 13/8

2 To D. C. Shimoga., letter no. 563 dy 19-8-15

Calls for the Ver: records on the subject and requests him to indicate the evidence upon which the conclusion is based that Bullamma and her representatives are Kadim tenants entitled to pay to the temple only the assessment on the land-

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GLB—20 000—20 1 12

GPB—70,000—17 12 15

G. R. S. 12]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | Mug File No. 628 of 1914.

	Serial No.	
	3	To the Inam Supdt., letter no 564 of 19 8-15. Calls for an extract from the Inam Register pertaining to the grant of Devadaya Inam ~~Dewa~~ land S. no. 11 of Hiresakuna village in the Sorab taluk to the Sri Ranganatha Devaru temple at Sorab
23-4	4	From the Inam Supdt., letter no. 30 of 21-8-15 States that the S. no. referred to is Sirkar land and not Inam -
D 1267	5	From the D. C. Shimoga., letter no. 312 of 31-1-16 States, in reply to Sl no. 2, that S. no. 11 of Hiresakuna village is a sirkar land in the Khata of Sri Ranganatha Devaru temple at Sorab, but in the possession & enjoyment of one Bullamma and her ancestors for ~~the past 12 years~~ over 25 years; that there is no documentary evidence available in support of the Kadim tenancy of Bullamma entitling ~~them~~ her to pay to the temple only the assessment ~~of~~ on the land in dispute, without paying any 'migate' to the temple - A report was called for from the Amildar by the Dy: Comr: as to how some of the

NOTE—Contn. sheet

GPB—70 000—17 12 15

Serial No.

lands in the khata of the temple peey "nigate", while some do not. The Amildar in his report dy 1-10-15 says that the record of enquiry in the matter has not been completed and that he will complete the enquiry and submit the records at the time of Taluk Jamabandy.

K

V

7 The opinion of the Advocate who was engaged, in accordance with sanction given in G. O. no. 2662-3/Mny 576-K-2 dy 4-5-12, to establish the proprietorship of the temple to the land in question, is filed with the ver: Records. He says that he did not try to establish the point, as there were not ~~proofs~~ evidences forthcoming to prove the same and that it is a matter for the Munsiff Deptt to deal with, as the temple is a Munsiff Institution.

L

The Munsiff has intimated to the Amildar that a Rajinama decree ~~has been~~ was given in the civil suit filed by one Nagar Subba Rao, to the effect that the plaintiff (Nagar Subba Rao) was the person entitled to the land in question.

From the ver: records and the Dy: Comrs letter it will be seen that there are no evidences to prove the Kadim tenancy of Bullamma and her ancestors, except that

NOTE—Contn. sheet

they have been in possession and enjoyment of ~~it~~ the land for a long time.

10. Subd. for orders with reference to the orders of the R. Secretary of 12.8.15 in page 2 of the note.

8/6/16

11. Being an unalienated land in the Khata of the temple no question of Kadim tenancy arises.

12. But assume can only be a tenant under the temple and the mere fact that she has been paying a fixed rent equal to assessment for many years past does not raise any presumption that she has any higher title than a tenancy at will.

13. The only question is whether she sets up a title adverse to the temple. Is the assessment which is the rent in this case paid to the temple by the tenant or to Govt. direct. Answer by letter in what capacity. Both the parties throw any light on the matter

P.T.O.

NOTE—Contn. sheet

1267

G R. S. 12]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | Mvg File No. 628 of 1914.

Serial No.

Q. U & M. | U. From the Statement of the Dharmadarsis, the report of the Shekdar and that of the Amildar, it will be seen that the ½ Kandayam together with the local cess is being paid to the temple direct; that Bellamma is dead and that one Nagar Subba Rao, the purchaser of the land from Bellamma's heir, has leased out the land and has been paying Kandayam only to the temple; and that though the land stands only nominally in the Khata of the temple, it appears to have lost all title to it.

How lost?

Subd. for orders
BJ 13/6/16 ann
14/6/16

From the statement of the Dharmadarsis it is clear that at one time these lands were lying waste and that they were leased out on a rent equal to Kandayam. It does not however mean that a permanent tenure was created thereby and the Dharmadarsis could not have made such a grant.

However whatever be the period that has elapsed since the nature of the loan remains as tenancy-at-will

NOTE—Contn. sheet

GPB—70 000—17 12 15

G.R. S. 12]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Mis. File No. 628 of 1916.

Serial No.

Capable of being revised. Requests the Bd. commr. to take up the question and deal with it early. The temple is an important one requiring greater income and it is not right to deny it any longer what is rightly its due. The temple, alienated lands and unalienated lands [illegible] 21.10.16 [illegible] examined appear and are equitable rent. charged for the benefit of the temple.

17. The bill in question is cancelled.

lss
21.10.16

18. A consolidated draft order cancelling the bill and requesting the Dy: Comr as above directed is subd for approval. The approved draft (in the file) cancelling the bill may, it is subd, be cancelled, as the cancelled bill has to be transmitted to the Comr & not returned to the Dy: Comr.

dl 111

amm
31/10/16

80
23/10/16

Put up clean draft.
lss
1.11.16

NOTE—Contn. sheet

G. R. S. 12]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Mug File No. 628 of 1914.

Serial No.

Clean draft subd
SD 1/11/16 anm 2/11/16

A draft is submitted for approval or other orders
he
(Ist Member) 6.11.16

Draft approved by the First Member
484 9.11.16 8.11.16 anm 10/11
Bds
he
10/11/16

6 No 1223-4 Dy 18.11.16, Dy Collr, Sheenda Distt recpt & Voucher, cancels the Lic for Rs 15/- on sale of the above explr requests Dy Collr to examine the temple leases in the area & report their revision dubt & refusal or action taken

NOTE—Contn. sheet

GPB—100,000—29-7-14

1914-15.

From

The Deputy Commissioner,

Shimoga District.

To

The Secretary to the Government of Mysore

General and Revenue Departments, (Muzrai Branch)

Bangalore.

Dated 21st May 1915.

Despatched 2nd June 15

Received

General No. 577

Muz No. 90

Enclosure No. One

Adverting to Government order No. 2000-3 Muz.P.577-11-9 dated 11th May 1915 reports re the cost of establishing the proprietorship of the temple of Sri Ranganatha Devaru Temple at Sorab.

No. 517
Inuzgo
Ti/.

Office of the Deputy Commissioner,
Shimoga District,
Dated Shimoga 31st May 1915.

From

C. Venkata Rao, Esquire., B.A.,
Offg. Deputy Commissioner,
Shimoga District.

DIARY No 1981
19 14 15
SECTION Inuz
FILE No. 628-14
SERIAL No. 1

To

D.V. Varadanga Rao, Esquire., B.A.B.L.,
Offg. Secretary to the Government of Mysore,
General and Revenue Departments, (Muzrai)
Bangalore.

Sir,

I have the honour to acknowledge Government order No.9869-3 Muz.F.570-11-9 dated 11th May 1915 sanctioning a bill for Rs 15/- towards the cost of establishing the proprietorship of the temple of Sri Ranganatha Swamy temple at Sorab to certain lands in the Munsiff Court at Sagar in a suit filed by Nagar Subba Rao against the cultivator of survey No.11 of Heresaluna village and calling for a report regarding the result of the proceedings in the matter, I have the honor to state that the land survey No. 11 of Heresaluna village in the Sorab Taluk is a sarlar land in the Patta of Sri Ranganatha Swamy at Sorab, the assessment thereon being Rs 25/- . It is reported by the Amildar of the Sorab taluk that the land in question was in the possession and enjoyment of one Bullamma and her ancestors for the past several years and that they were not paying any 'migote' to the temple. The Dharmadarsies of the temple also say that there are Kadim tenants paying only assessment to the temple.

2. On the death of Bullamma the land was sold by Sivarudrappa, a relation of her to Nagar Subba Rao who filed a suit for the possession of the land against Chimanur Chennabasappa another relation of Bullamma who was cultivating the land. As the temple is entitled to only the kandayam of the land, the claim of the cultivator for possession of the land was not contested by the lawyer on behalf of the temple. The suit ended in a compromise between the parties and the Munsiff has passed a decree in favor of the plaintiff, Nagar Subba Rao

No expenditure has been incurred in the case and the bill is forwarded herewith for cancellation.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Offg. Deputy Commissioner,

Chimoga District.

C.N.R.

Calls for further information re the proprietorship of the temple of Sri Ranganatha Devaru at Sorab to certain Devadayam land.

G. R. S. 26]

File No. S-76-11

Serial No. 628-14

Diary No. of letter replied to 1981

No. 563

General and Revenue Secretariat

(Mug)

, *the* *191* .

To The Deputy Commr, Shimoga District.

Date of issue 19.9.65

Signed by M.S. Rama Chandra Rao

Sir,

With reference to correspondence ending with your letter no S17/90 of 2-6-15 stating that the expenditure of Rs 15 sanctioned by Govt in their order no. 2662-3/Mug 576-11-2 of 11.5.12 for establishing the proprietorship of the temple of Sri Ranganatha Devaru (Devadayadam) at Sorab to land S. No. 11 of Heresakuna village in the Sorab Taluk

over.

SUBJECT.

13

was not incurred, as the temple is entitled to only the Kandayam on the land and the claim of the cultivator for possession of the land was not contested ~~by the Lawyer~~, I am directed to request ~~Board~~ you to kindly & send us the Ver: records on the subject and also to indicate the evidence upon which the conclusion is based that Bullamma and her representatives are hadiem tenants entitled to pay only the assessment on the land to the temple ~~to the temple~~.

I have etc

lha
15.8.

for Secretary
to Govt
RL in the Rev: Dept.
14/8/15

List of enclosures

Copied by

Examined by

GPB—25,000—4 3 13

Calls for an extract of the Inam Register relating to the Devadaya Inam land of Sri Ranganatha at Sorab — — —

2 Encls

G. R. S. 26]

File No. 576-11

Serial No. 6788-14

3

Diary No. of letter replied to 1981

No. 564

General and Revenue Secretariat

(May)

, the *191* .

To

The Supdt & of Inam Settlements in Mysore, Bangalore.

Date of issue 9 5 15

Signed by Nor. Ms Ramachandra Rao

Sir,

I am directed to request that an extract of the Inam Register pertaining to the plant Devadaya Inam land S. no. 11 of Neresatima village in the Sorab Taluk ~~belonging~~ to the Sri Ranganatha Swamy temple at Sorab, may kindly be forwarded for reference at an early date. Thence etc

for Secretary

SUBJECT.

for Secretary
to Govt
in the Rev: Dept.
8/5/1915

List of enclosures

Copied by

Examined by

GPB—25,000—4-3-13

No. 30

Enc. —

Office of the Superintendent of
Inam Settlements in Mysore,
Dated Bangalore, 21st August 1915

DIARY No 354

19/8/1915
SECTION Mer
FILE No. 628-14
SERIAL No. 4

From D K Darashah Esq., B A,
D. Shama Bola Esq.,
Superintendent of Inam Settlements
in Mysore, Bangalore.

To

V R. Thyagaraja Iyer Esq^r M A.

Secretary to the Government of
H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore,
~~Revt~~ and Rev. Dept^s.

Sir,

With reference to your letter no 564/Mer 628-14 3 dated 19th August 1915 requesting to be furnished with a copy of the Inam Register pertaining to the grant of Devadaya Inam land S No 11 of Heresakuna village, Sorab Taluk, to the Sri Ranganatha Devaru temple at Sorab, I have the honor to state that the said Survey number is Sirkar land and not Inam.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient Servant

D K Darashah

Superintendent of Inam Settlements in Mysore

(TPB—800—23 9 10)

1915

From

The Superintendent.
Inam Settlements
in Mysore.

To

The Secy. to the Govt. of
H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore,
~~*Genl. &*~~ *Rev. Depts.*

Dated
Despatched 21st August 1915

No. 30.
Enc —

SUBJECT.

States that S. No 11 of Hire Jakkuna village is Sirkar

DIARY No. 1267
9/5-19 16
SECTION Rev 2
FILE No. 628-14
SERIAL No. 557

1915-16.

From

The Deputy Commissioner,

Chimoga District.

To The Secretary to the Government of Mysore,
Revenue Department,
Bangalore.

Dated 21st January 1916

Despatched

Received

General No. 312

No.

Enclosure No.

Reports re the proprietorship of the temple of Sri Ramarathaleswaru at Sorab to certain lands.

GPB—75 reams—25-5-10

C.312 Muz 54
Enc IV file

Office of the Deputy Commissioner
Shimoga District,
Dated Shimoga 31st January 1916

From

V. Matthan, Esquire, B.A.,
Deputy Commissioner,
Shimoga District.

To

W.R. Thyagaraja Iyer, Esquire, M.A.,
Secretary to the Government of Mysore,
Revenue Department,
Bangalore.

Sir,

Adverting to your letter No.503 Muzrai 028-14-9 dated the 19th August 1915 calling for further report regarding the proprietorship of the temple of Sri Ranganatha Devaru at Sorab to certain lands and a subsequent reminder No.1845 dated the 15th January 1916 thereon I have the honor to state that the land S.No.11 of Hiresaluna village is a sirkar land consisting of dry and wet plots measuring 7 acres and 0 guntas bearing an assessment of $ 23/- in aggregate as detailed in the margin. The

	A. G.	Rs.	as.	P
Dry.	1-30	0	8	0
Wet.	5-10	22	8	0
Total	7-0	23	0	0

this
Khate of the land stands in the name of Sri Ranganatha Devaru temple at Sorab and the land was in the possession and enjoyment of one Bullamma and her ancestors without paying any 'migate' to the temple.

2. Chimanur Channabasappa bin Erappa, a relation of Bullamma, has stated in his statement before the Amildar on 22nd November 1911 that the land in question was in the possession of his grandmother (mother's mother) Gurulingavva who died about 20 years ago that the land then came to the possession of her adopted son Siddappa and afterwards to his wife Bullamma.

3. There is nothing on record to show how the land in question came

to the possession of Gurulingavva and for what period it remained in the hands of her ancestors. It can however be understood that the land has continued to be in the possession and enjoyment of this family for over 25 years.

4. It is seen from the Amildar's report that the land in question was in the possession of Bullamma and her ancestors for the past several years and that they were not paying any 'migate' to the temple. The Dharmadarsies of the temple also say that they are kadim tenants paying only the assessment with its cesses to the temple.

5. Apart from the above facts there is no documentary evidence available in support of the Kadim tenancy of Bullamma and her representatives entitling them to pay to the temple only the assessment on the land in dispute.

6. The file of vernacular papers relating to the subject is herewith submitted for perusal and obliging return.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Deputy Commissioner,

Shimoga District.

C.N.R.

Cancels a bill for Rs 15/- on account of expenditure incurred in connection with a civil suit connected with the Sri Ranganathaswami Temple at Sorab and requests the Dy. Comr to take up the question of the renewal of the lease of lands in the Khata of the temple

G.R.S. 28]

13/4

File No. 628-14

Serial No. 6

Diary No of letter replied to 1267

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(May)

READ—

, *the* 191

Proc^gs no. 56-3, May 1914

Date of issue 18-11-1916.

action

Signed by

ORDER THEREON—No

ex

ing the right of the temple of Sri Ranganatha Devaru at Sira

over

SUBJECT.

GPB—50,000—1-12-12

J. I

report on the result of the proceedings-

2 -orrespondence ending with

[illegible] No. 312/Mug 574 dt 1-2-16 from the P W D

Dy. Comr, Shimoga District, stating

that S. No 11 of Hirisanna village

measuring 7 acres [illegible] and

assessed at Rs 23 is an unalienated

land in the Khata of the temple;

that the land was long in the

enjoyment of one Bullamma and

her ancestors and latterly purchased

by one Rayar Subba Rao; that the

temple was [illegible]

assessment on the land by the

tenant all along and that conse-

quently the temple's claim to the

possession of the land was not

put forward in the case which

was compromised by the parties; as

to warrant of cancellation the

WC for Rs 151- as no expenditure

was incurred in the case.

Order [illegible]: 1223-4 Encl & I D 18.11.916

Mus 628-14-6

The bill in question is cancelled

G.R S. 27]

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(*Continuation sheet draft form.*)

and transmitted to the superior.

2. As regards the right of the temple to the full ownership of the land in question, it seems to be clear from the statements of the Dharmadors that at one time the Khatedar and the other tenants of the temple were at one time [illegible] to various tenants on rents equal to the assessment on them. It does not appear that it was ever contemplated to confer upon them any right of permanent occupancy and the circumstances of the case would seem to preclude such a supposition.

3. The Dy. Commr. is requested to examine the temple leases in question with a view to see whether they are capable of revision and to secure for the temple an equitable rent on

GPB—20,000—7-7-14

for its ownership - The question may be taken up early and a report submitted for the information of Govt as regards the action taken -

hla
6.11.16

For Secretary
Genl Deptt

Fair draft
attn
2/11/16

To.

The Dy. Comr, Shimoga Dtt,

rets the rec: records -

Comptr to Govt with the cancelled bill -

SD
1/11/16

MM
8/11